DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 436 CE 007 174

TITLE	Proceedings of the Joint Meeting: National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (Scottsdale, Arizona, November 14-15, 1974).
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Nov 74
NOTE	51p.; For related documents, see CE 007 171-175
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Conference Reports; *Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; *Legal Responsibility; National Organizations; Speeches; State Agencies; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	CETA; Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; NACVE; National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education; SACVE; State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education; Vocational Education Amendments

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the joint meeting of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, held in November, 1974, are presented. The agenda of the two-day meeting is followed by the texts of speeches presented at the meeting: (1) Overview Statement: Issues Facing the National and State Advisory Councils, by Paul Kerr; (2) Advisory Councils' Legal Responsibilities Under the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments (PL 90-576) and the Proposed 1975 Vocational Educational Amendments, by James Zancanella; (3) Advisory Councils' Legal Responsibilities Under the 1972 Vocational Education Amendments (PL 93-380) and the 1974 Amendments (PL 92-318), by Robert Lawrence; (4) Advisory Councils' Legal Responsibilities Under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA, PL 92-203), by Daniel Kruger; and (5) National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, by Kenneth Cole. Concluding the document are the reports of three workshops focusing on the following topics: (1) 1968 vocational education amendments and proposed 1975 amendments, (2) vocational education amendments of 1972 and 1974, and (3) the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The text of "The Resolution Established by the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education relative to Federal support of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education" is provided. (EC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123436

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
JOINT MEETING

National and State

Advisory Councils

On

Vocational Education

November 14&15, 1974
Scottsdale, Arizona

AGENDA

CE007174

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CHANGING RESPONSIBILITIES OF NATIONAL AND STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE.

thursday, nov. 14

SONORA ROOM B

8:00 AM REGISTRATION

9:00 AM VICA OPENING CEREMONY

9:15 AM ARIZONA WELCOME
Mr. Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State

9:30 AM INTRODUCTIONS & PLAN OF ACTION
Mr. Harlan Giese, Iowa

9:45 AM STATEMENT ON YOUTH FROM THE WHITE HOUSE
Ms. Pam Powell

9:50 AM NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT
Mr. John Thiele, Vice-Chairman

COMMITTEE REPORTS

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES
Mr. Donald N. McDowell
PROGRAM REVIEW
Mrs. Margo Thornley
RESEARCH & EVALUATION
Dr. Duane Lund
LEGISLATION & APPROPRIATIONS
Sen.W.Hughes Brockbank (Legislation)
Mr.David Van Alstyne, Jr. (Appropriations)
CAREER EDUCATION & YOUTH
Mrs. Caroline Hughes
Miss JoAnn Cullen (Youth)
BUSINESS, LABOR & EDUCATION
Mr. Frank Cannizzaro
COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION & INFORMATION
Mr. John W. Thiele

10:15 AM COFFEE BREAK

10:45 AM OVERVIEW STATEMENT: ISSUES FACING THE NATIONAL & STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS
Mr. Paul Kerr, Oregon

INTRODUCTION OF TOPICS FOR THE AFTERNOON WORKSHOPS

11:15 AM ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS (PL 90-576) AND THE PROPOSED 1975 VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AMENDMENTS
Dr. James Zancanella, Wyoming

11:25 AM ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE 1972 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS (PL 93-380) AND 1974 AMENDMENTS (PL 92-318)
Mr. Bob Lawrence, California

11:35 AM ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING ACT (CETA, PL 92-203)
Dr. Daniel Kruger, Michigan

11:45 AM LUNCH - *Loggia Room*

1:15 PM WORKSHOPS ON ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES

WORKSHOP I

1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS AND PROPOSED 1975 AMENDMENTS

GROUP A - Sonora Room B
Room Leader: Ms. Virginia Verig, Nebraska

GROUP B - Sonora Room B
Room Leader: Mr. Doug Fellows, Connecticut

WORKSHOP II

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 AND 1974

El Caserio Room
Room Leader: Mr. Richard Owens, Georgia

WORKSHOP III

COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING ACT (CETA)

Suites 183 and 191
Room Leader: Mr. Francis Morrison, Indiana

2:45 PM REFRESHMENT BREAK

3:15 PM PARTICIPANTS ATTEND SECOND WORKSHOP

4:45 PM MEETING RECESS

6:00 PM NO-HOST ATTITUDE ADJUSTMENT HOUR

friday, nov. 15

SONORA ROOM B

9:00 AM ADDRESS
Dr. Weldon P. Shofstall
ARIZONA STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

9:15 AM ADDRESS
Dr. Eugene Dorr
ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT OF CAREER EDUCATION AND ARIZONA STATE DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

9:30 AM WORKSHOP ROOM LEADER REPORTS

11:00 AM GUEST SPEAKER
Mr. Kenneth R. Cole, Jr.
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, THE WHITE HOUSE

NOON ADJOURNMENT OF THE JOINT MEETING

SPEECHES

OVERVIEW STATEMENT:
ISSUES FACING THE NATIONAL AND STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

by Paul Kerr

My first remarks will concern the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. The National Advisory Council has issued eight significant reports. In my opinion, these reports have exerted considerable influence on education in this country.

The first report, dated July 15, 1969, came during one of the worst social periods in the recent history of the United States. I wonder if you remember what was happening then? Let us look at the report. It states that "...men and women who cannot qualify for decent jobs distrust the society which reared them...campus and inner city revolt reaches into our schools...racial unrest, violence and unemployment of youth have their roots in inadequate education...our nation seethes."

Then the school rebellion was in the colleges and universities. Today, rebellion still remains, although more subdued. Today, the rebellion has moved to the secondary schools.

What has been accomplished? What still needs to be accomplished? What are the issues? These are the topics that I shall address myself to today.

A little while ago, you heard from the staff of the National Advisory Council on various actions which have resulted from these eight Council reports. I would now like to briefly summarize parts of these reports which I will use as subject points for further discussion.

The July 1969 report called for a fresh approach to vocational education. It asked that the federal government, through the 1968 Vocational Amendments, exercise its leadership to cure our country of intellectual snobbery.

The second report in November 1969 indicated that the federal government was showing more response to the crisis of the unemployed youth than in reducing the flow of untrained youth into the labor pool.

The third report stated that employment should be an integral part of education. As I am from a State Employment Agency, I feel that this does represent a topic for further discussion. Very briefly, I am not in disagreement with the ideas presented in this report. I do, however, feel that it is important for schools at the local level to work closely with state employment offices. Both can gain from this. Cooperative

agreements can also be established at the state level. This is a good subject for State Council involvement, and I will leave the subject there: for your further consideration.

The third report also stated that parents and students should participate in the development of vocational programs. I feel this to be most important.

The fourth report was concerned with national and state objectives. Of particular note was the statement in this report that the "State Plan" was nothing more than a compliance document.

The fifth report demanded that the previous recommendations be acted upon. It asked that vocational and technical education be given organizational parity in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. And, again, this parity was asked for in order to advance the Commissioner's goals for career education as a national policy. This was in June 1971 and was the National Council's first mention of career education.

The sixth report, June 1, 1972, recommended that pre-service and in-service programs in vocational and career education be provided for all counselors, and that counselors be more aware of job opportunities and the labor market demands. I will refer to this again.

The Council's seventh report in 1972 was devoted to vocational student organizations.

The eighth report dated September 1974 looked at the present educational system and still saw a "bewildering variety of designations." The call now was for integration of all educational resources. And this integration was to be called "career education." Vocational education is now referred to as "an integral part of career education."

I see this eighth report as an angry, unmistakable demand for action. It says that everybody talks of change but there is no change. If the public looks to career education as the way to bring relevance to American education--and vocational education--then let us accept and use career education for that purpose. "Career education" has now become a universal term.

Much of what went into these reports has since become the subject of discussion, state and federal action, and legislation. I recall that the sixth report on counseling was used in Oregon as the basis for two series of recommendations and an evaluation which is still going on by our Advisory Council.

The National Advisory Council has done much to make more effec-

tive the implementation of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The National Council has achieved this by its strongly worded reports, its review and evaluation of vocational education programs, its flow of information to the State Advisory Councils, its appearances before various legislative subcommittees, advisory councils, and other groups concerned with the oversight hearings, and its concern with the '72 and '74 Acts.

In addition, this Council has consulted with many organizations and held public meetings and hearings on the subject of vocational and career education.

I note that legislation is underway to make the "National Advisory Council and its staff an independent council advising the Commissioner and the Congress on the conduct of vocational education in the United States." (Senate Report No. 1386). This is certainly to the good.

...I would like to stop here for a moment to make a comment. The Oregon Council is, and has been, very appreciative of the work done by the members and staff of the National Advisory Council. We feel that they have done a great job!

...Now let me turn to the State Advisory Councils. There are many kinds of problems that the State Advisory Councils and their members have faced in their efforts to both exist and become independent from various destructive forces.

In 1970, Sam Burt addressed some remarks on this subject before a joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils. He had previously warned the members that some professional educators would use two strategies to disrupt the newly formed State Advisory Councils. These strategies were to control and to confuse. Now Mr. Burt was ready to describe some additional strategies in the arsenal of these professionals to prevent the laymen from becoming too deeply involved in the field of education. He likened these strategies to burial shrouds.

According to Mr. Burt, the third of these strategies used by some professional educators was that of simply ignoring you: not attending your meetings, paying no attention to your reports, and so frustrating you that you quit. Some members may have done just that!

For those that did not, the fourth strategy to be used was disparagement and detraction. The validity and soundness of the judgment of a Council member would be questioned. The purpose was to

make it impossible for the Council's recommendations to receive credence and acceptance.

If this failed, the next strategy involved Federal and State legislation establishing new Advisory Councils appointed with responsibilities overlapping that of your Council. It would then become necessary to call for coordination of state programs--but the coordinators are the same professionals who didn't want Advisory Councils in the first place! This strategy leads to the catatonic ineffectiveness of the Council and the Council members. It is called the shroud of proliferation.

If none of these strategies work, then the coup d'etat is always available. This strategy calls for seeing that troublesome Council members are not reappointed when their term of office expires.

The NACVE News of January 1974 contained a report of Sam Burt's latest shroud. Sam noted that the Council members had indeed managed to survive each previous strategy that the bureaucracy had designed. And in doing so, they had grown to be: "perceptive, independent evaluators of the vocational education programs within their state." (A quote from Congressman Carl Perkins.)

Sam now introduced the "Peter Principle Shroud." This is applied only to the more effective and successful Councils. Two things are involved. First, it is necessary to highly praise the Council for the effective job that it is doing in vocational education. Then the State Legislature and the Governor give the Advisory Council many additional responsibilities in the field of manpower development or other related activities. As a result, the Council has little time to devote to vocational and career education. I shall mention this again.

Now let me turn to the more mundate, month by month aspects of running an Advisory Council. I will take Oregon's present Advisory Council as an example. I am sure that the similarities to your Councils will be apparent.

First, the structure. We have an Advisory Council Chairman who serves as an ex-officio member of all Advisory Council standing and ad hoc committees. He is also the chairman of the executive committee. This committee establishes yearly goals, objectives, and priorities and assigns projects and programs to Advisory Council committees.

We also have four standing committees. There is a Planning Committee. This committee works on the State Plan. It also looks into

regional, county, and local planning. The Evaluation Committee examines the effectiveness of the various programs conducted under the State Plan and submits an annual evaluation report. The Legislative Relations Committee identifies, monitors, and interprets current and proposed Federal and State rules, regulations, and guidelines related to vocational and career education. Its members particularly try to meet with the State Legislature. The Public Information Committee provides various publics with timely and relevant information on career education programs.

None of the Council members has the time to do the research necessary for committee use, to summarize the meetings, to call members to meetings, to engage in the constant correspondence necessary, to assist the members to establish their goals, objectives, and priorities. This requires a full-time position, which in Oregon has been assigned to an Executive Director.

Despite the work of the Executive Director, the time required by the Council members, and especially those who are standing committee chairpersons, has greatly increased over the years. Our initial direction required that the Advisory Council "shall meet not less than four times per year." At present, there is a meeting almost every month as well as frequent additional monthly committee meetings. Full Council meetings that once took less than six hours now take over eight hours and still do not always complete the necessary business. Meetings that previously were held in one area of the state now are being spread throughout the state. Visitors to the meetings from both education and the outside community are increasing. Members of the state legislature and local advisory councils drop in, and sometimes make comments.

Even so, we feel that our effectiveness is just beginning. We visit school classes involved in vocational education, but have done little to bring the students or the parents to our meetings, or to single students out during our visits and talk to them.

We have just developed a brochure which we will send out to local vocational and career education advisory groups. The brochure requests that these advisory groups help us to determine new directions, identify specific goals and make specific recommendations. We ask them to tell us how Oregon's Career Education needs are being served. We offer to speak out for their concerns. We are also starting a newsletter as a vehicle for sharing ideas. Much more needs to be done:

These local councils are the heart of the state career and vocational education programs and require our attention.

Our Council does not have a member who belongs to the state legislature as some of you do. Sometimes we think that this might be important since our legislature has voted little money to the Department of Education for Career Education, despite good support from our Governor, Tom McCall.

I am sure that most of you realize some of the potential that your Council has for increasing the effectiveness of your state vocational and career education programs. The State Plan does not have to be a compliance document. Your Advisory Council can evaluate the goals, objectives, activities, outcomes, and benefits of the programs conducted by each of your departments of education.

You can request and get an exact monetary breakdown of all monies spent for career and vocational education. You will not get such things easily or immediately; but to be effective, these are the things you must do and ask for.

May I also state that you cannot accept paper outcomes stating that a certain percentage of some population has been served. You will have to get a more complete report of what happened.

To go still further, taken by itself, the statement that your department of education conducted four regional workshops outlining methodology of implementing interdisciplinary approaches to the disadvantaged and handicapped means very little. What were the objectives of the workshops? How well did they support the goals of the State Department of Education? What procedures were followed? How effective were these procedures? What were the results of these workshops? To what extent were the participants able to more effectively do their job as a result of the workshop? It is questions like these that give meaning to the State Plan.

One note: Your evaluation committee will have to randomly select a manageable number of such statements from the State Plan to review. The results should enable your State Advisory Council to continue to improve the quality of their annual reports.

During the five years that the State Councils have been in existence, a unique cooperative role has been established between the National and State Advisory Councils. State Council recommendations, reports, and suggestions sent or otherwise transmitted to the National Council have been considered, acted upon, and sometimes formed the basis of

various national reports.

A recent example of the latter is the special report prepared for Congress on the 1975 Amendments by the National Advisory Council. This was based on much of the information collected in the spring of 1974 by the State Advisory Councils.

I should also mention that recently five State Advisory Councils were invited to testify before Congress regarding proposed 1975 Vocational Amendments. This cannot but imply a growth in the stature of Advisory Councils which I hope will continue.

The work of the State Advisory Councils has also grown enormously; and the future responsibilities should expand through the enactment of three additional acts by Congress. Are we prepared financially to handle such additonal work?

Some states have been successful in obtaining state funds to supplement the federal support of their Council. That is not the case in Oregon or in the large majority of states. No state now receives more than $105,796 in federal funds. Twenty-eight states and territories receive $35,265 each. Oregon is in the latter group.

What are some of Oregon's needs? We need additional money to do a more comprehensive evaluation at the state and local school level to measure the effectiveness of career and educational programs. We need additional money for secretarial and clerical help, for travel expenses of the members, and for the publishing of special reports and other information. You can probably add to this list.

Our Council, and other Councils, have written letters to Congress on this funding issue. Warren Magnuson, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor--Health, Education and Welfare, wrote in answer to a letter from the Washington Advisory Council: "It is a matter of some concern to Congress that HEW has disregarded the intent of the law. The House-passed Labor HEW bill (HR 15580) includes $4.3 million for State Councils and directs that funds be distributed according to provisions in the basic law...."

Just this morning, we heard that the Senate has also acted on this bill. It is now up to the President. I hope that he will act both quickly and favorably.

A little earlier, I mentioned additional responsibilities that could come to the Advisory Council through the enactment of three additional acts by Congress. Let's quickly look at these acts.

First, President Ford has signed into law HR 69 (The Educational

Amendments Act of 1974). Section 406 of the law, titled "Career Education," sets up a separate Office of Career Education in the Office of Education. Kenneth Hoyt has been named the Associate Commissioner for Career Education.

This Act further establishes a National Advisory Council on Career Education--the Chairman of our National Advisory Council will be one of nine non-voting ex-officio members.

The objectives of Section 406 are close to those contained in some state plans. Present State Advisory Councils, some of which already contain the name "Career Education" may feel, and rightly so, that it is their job to assist state departments of education to implement Section 406 of the '74 Amendments.

The next law to be considered is the Education Amendment of 1972 which, among other things, amends part of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Title X of this Act specifically refers to community colleges and occupational education. Part B gets directly into occupational education programs. Several further sections clearly refer to activities concerning the Advisory Councils. For example, Section 1054 (2) refers to occupational education that will "promote and encourage occupational preparation, counseling and guidance, and job placement or placement in post-secondary occupational education programs as a responsibility of elementary and secondary schools" (my emphasis).

There are two key statements in this Act. The first is the more familiar. Section 1055 (2)(1):

> "the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education will be charged with the same responsibilities with respect to the program authorized by this part as it has with respect to programs authorized under the Vocational Education Act of 1963."

The second statement has at least equal significance:

> "Section 1056. (2)...the Commissioner shall make available to the State the amount of its allotment under Section 1052 for the following purposes--
>
> > "(1)...to strengthen the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education in order that it may effectively carry out the additional functions imposted by this part...."

I hope that the discussions to be held during this meeting will more clearly establish the intent of this law concerning State Advisory Councils. At this point, it appears that we do have a part to play under

this Act.

Finally, I would like to look at Public Law 93-203, more familiarly known as CETA. Many of the activities of CETA concern vocational education. As departments of education and the schools get more involved with the CETA programs, the need to evaluate the procedures will become apparent. Much of the planning will be done by prime sponsors who have not before been involved with such activities.

But there is more than this. Title I, Section 112 (a) says:

> "From the funds available to him for this section the secretary shall make grants to Governors to provide financial assistance through vocational education boards, to provide needed vocational education services in areas served by prime sponsors."

The money in question represents five percent of the funds available under Title I (Section 103 c).

If we enter into these three areas set aside by public law, will we find ourselves in conflict with other advisory councils and committees who have jurisdictions and responsibilities overlapping ours? Will we further find ourselves unable to follow our primary goals? Will we be forced, then, to involve ourselves almost entirely with general policy?

We must go carefully here and try to avoid Burt's shroud of proliferation or his "Peter Principle Shroud"!

Our response, then, to these three public laws represents a major issue for the State and National Advisory Councils to consider.

My next issue was the subject of discussion by Chairman Perkins at the Raleigh Hearing. It concerns the disadvantaged and handicapped. How effective have we been in these programs? Is it true that the minimums required by states to spend for the disadvantaged and handicapped under the Vocational Act Amendments have been ignored by some states? The General Accounting Office may say this. Do you agree with the statement that "it is best to put your money where it will do the most good"? The best place to put your money could be where you will find the greatest amount of interest and dedication to help!

Where should the mentally retarded be in the '75 Amendments? Do you feel that the educable mentally retarded can be helped by career and vocational education programs? I sincerely hope you do!

Have the disadvantaged disappeared from sight as the light of yesterday's fires become extinguished? Read the second report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education again. Don't

look too much to CETA. CETA is mainly concerned with the crisis of the unemployed and the underemployed. Remember, our main goal is to prevent the flow of untrained youth going into the labor pool. To do this, we must make sure that the disadvantaged and handicapped are not ignored in our programs.

At the same time, we must make sure that industry restructures jobs to make better use of our educated manpower. This has got to be a major long-term goal!

Now, I would like to discuss a different issue, but one that is quite personal to me because it involves the Employment Service as well as one of my special interests.

As the result of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, the State Employment Security Agencies have the statutory responsibility to develop and share with the Boards of Education "occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere...."

Some of the other public laws previously mentioned also refer to occupational information. Some drafts of the new Vocational Education Act have language that would continue or expand the State Employment Security Agency's role in developing occupational information.

The "Report of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education" prepared for Congressional Oversight Hearings states (p. 5) that the "Department of Labor and the Department of HEW continue to require data in different formats not easily translatable from one system to another. This is frustrating to people at the local level who cannot use Labor Department projections for vocational education planning...."

Considerable work is being done to resolve this issue. In Oregon, a Career Information System has been formed on a consortium basis. The CIS staff has generalized occupational descriptions which they update each six months. These descriptions can be accessed directly or through a structural approach. The latter is a form of occupational game play using a computer. Labor market information is obtained for this system mostly through the Employment Division.

The Oregon Employment Division has developed a system called SEARCH (Systems Exploration and Research for Career Help). This system is Worker Train Group (WTG) based. Access occurs through the initial use of the General Aptitude Test Battery and a WTG Inter-

est Check List. A computer printout brings the results of both together. The student then verifies the WTGs arrived at and moves out into clusters or occupations. This system works with any DOT-based clusters or guides. Most of the schools in Oregon use one or both of these systems.

The Oregon Employment Division has also developed and exported to twenty-three other states an Occupational Employment Statistic Program. This program uses about 2500 base jobs. Information is obtained through the use of a series of complex well-structured surveys: different for each industry.

The Oregon State Department of Education has put our labor market statistics, the census data, its own supply data, and other information into a computer at Oregon State University. They have then developed a Career Program Planning System to provide and access updated information for career planners.

It is highly probable that other states present are doing equal kinds of work. In this area, at least, some breakthrough is occuring.

I should also add that through CETA, three million dollars have been appropriated for an Occupational Information Systems Grants program. Ten states may receive these grants.

For the next issue, I would like to return to the eighth report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. This report says that "we must stop talking about change and start changing...we must somehow repeal irrelevance in American education."

Let me go still further. The constraints placed on education must change. Education must become more individualized. "Education" must expand beyond the boundaries of a formal education system. We must accept along with John Gardner "that there are many kinds of further learning outside formal high school and college programs." Gardner, in his book Excellence, says that "we must make available to young people far more information than they now have on post-high school opportunities other than college." He believes that "Jobs themselves are a form of education."

Further, we need to bring education into every aspect of society and life with the individual as a core. In 1958, the Soviet Union engaged in a comprehensive and imaginative effort to radically reconstruct their entire system of schools. George Counts, reviewing this Communist thesis in a book called Khruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education, asked, "Is a democracy capable of subjecting its own system of education to a comparable reexamination and reconstruc-

tion in terms of its own resources, institutions, and values?"

I say "yes," change is possible. But it is not possible when more of a wrong solution is applied ("more of the same"). The solution is to reframe the situation. Reframing does not involve imposing your ideas on those whom you wish to change. You do not try to teach educators, students, and parents a new language. Rather, you try to take into account their own views, expectations, and understandings.

You do not impose your concept of vocational and career education. Instead you go out into the community and ask "what kind of education do you want?" The answer will be in concepts that the students and parents understand--and it most likely will still be vocational and career education! But career education as they see it.

ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS (PL 90-576) AND THE PROPOSED 1975 VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AMENDMENTS

by James Zancanella

In outlining the issues dealing with PL 90-576, VEA '68, I have selected some that have been discussed before at these Joint Council meetings. Some of these issues were also covered in the VEA '68 impact report by the National and State Advisory Councils that was prepared for the Congressional Oversight Hearings. Let's take a look at where we are as State Advisory Councils: Have we fulfilled our responsibilities under the 1968 Vocational Education Act? What are some of our responsibilities? I would like to present this review:

1) To function independently and autonomously. Nineteen Councils have been designated state agencies. Is yours one of them? Perhaps, if you are like Wyoming, after five years we are still working on this issue. We have not resolved it as of this date, but we have not given up.

2) To advise the State Board on the development of the State Plan for Vocational Education. Most of the Councils have had significant input, and others are still having difficulty with their State Boards.

3) To advise the State Board on policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan as to the availability of vocational education to persons needing such education. We have had difficulty with this responsibility in Wyoming, and I understand that other Councils have not been having one hundred percent success in getting their State Boards to accept and implement their recommendations.

4) To hold public meetings. Our charge has been to reach and hear from all the public--students, parents, teachers, businessmen, employers, labor leaders, trade craftsmen, and industrial

leaders. For some Councils this has been very effective; others have had problems. Attendance at public meetings has not always been good.

5) To evaluate at the state and local school level the effectiveness and accomplishments of vocational education in terms of the goals and objectives contained in the State Plan. In too many cases, Councils have accepted the reports from staff members. Council members have not taken the time to evaluate programs. In my opinion, every Council member should evaluate one or two programs each year. Doing this should make a more effective member.

6) To recommend changes in programs, services and activities as may be warranted by the evaluation. We have the responsibility of encouraging the State Board (and other involved state agencies) to accept and implement Council recommendations. We have been fairly successful in Wyoming, but many times we have not persisted. The VEA '68 impact study asked: To what extent have the recommendations contained in your Council's evaluation report been implemented. A total of forty states responded to this question. Twenty-two, or over sixty percent, reported extensive implementation of the recommendations. Some Councils indicated that they were developing expertise in the formulation of their recommendations which was beginning to result in an increase in implementation. This is convincing evidence. The evidence does indicate that Councils have been effective in accepting their responsibilities in meeting the needs of people.

7) To publish any special reports as may be deemed warranted in addition to the annual report. Our responsibility here has been to disseminate the annual report to the National Advisory Council, the USOE, all other appropriate state and local agencies, and interested organizations and individuals. In most cases, the reports have been directed at improving vocational education. However, there have been some reports that I have seen that appear to have placed state education officials in an "adversary" relationship to Councils. Some of the special studies have not "generated" the objective data considered necessary for evalua-

tive deliberations.

8) A final responsibility of State Advisory Councils with respect to their findings and recommendations, although not spelled out in the Vocational Amendments of 1968, deals with advocacy. We are supposed to operate as partners with State Boards and State Departments of Education, and any other involved state agencies and organizations. We, as Councils, must actively support needed changes in legislation affecting vocational education. In some cases, I have to question our success in this area. This is probably our major reason for attending this joint meeting today.

If your Advisory Council has been successfully performing these activities, then you have been meeting your legal responsibilities to meet the needs of the people in your state. I believe we are doing an acceptable job. I think we are attempting to discharge procedural responsibilities properly and effectively. I do believe that as Councils on Vocational Education, we have been and are committed to the cause of vocational education. We are performing our legal responsibility to the state, its citizens, and the educational system to meet the needs of the people.

Our assignment this afternoon is to look at the present legislation, PL 90-576, the '68 Vocational Education Act, and to take a critical look at the proposed '75 legislation. The present proposed new legislation includes HR 17304, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1975, HR 17305, the Post-Secondary Vocational Education Act of 1975, and the Administration's proposal, "A Structural Compilation of Legislative Concepts for Improving Vocational Legislation." I see a few barriers in the new proposed legislation that could impede Advisory Council effectiveness and may curtail Council activities as they have been performed under PL 90-576, VEA '68. Some of the new responsibilities look good. However, in your group discussions, I would suggest you take a serious look at definitions, the 40-40-20 concept, (post-secondary act) and local coordinating committees. Other items and issues you should investigate are:

1) Membership selection. I still have a question in my mind as to who should select the State Advisory Council membership. I

believe that having the State Board of Education select membership in all states, whether the Board is elected or not, would be better than having the Governor of the state perform this function. I realize this may be different from state to state. My reason for preferring the State Board of Education is that more people are involved in making the Council member selection. In some cases where the Governor selects, it may become too political.

2) Membership expansion. We could have a serious problem develop where we simply have too many Council members to be effective. In my opinion, having more than fifteen people on one committee has a tendency to delay decisions. I question the value of having too many groups in a state represented on an Advisory Council.

3) The necessity of evaluation reports is again included in the new proposed legislation. The discussion group should take a careful look at this requirement. The new proposed legislation again gives HEW authorization to make certain appropriations. I have felt that our present legislation gives HEW too much control over selected appropriations. I would rather let our states make the decision. I am not for complete non-categorical aid as such, but I think state control for funding the categories included in the legislation is desirable.

4) The proposed new legislation calls for State Councils to have control over certain amounts of appropriations for distribution within their states. We should take a careful look at this. This may give us some responsibility that we do not want. It could weaken our Councils and make us subject to strong pressure groups. It could weaken our position as evaluators and motivators of good state vocational education programs.

5) Career education funding is another question we should discuss. Should funding for career education be separate from vocational education? Should we use vocational education money for career education programs?

6) There should be a careful examination of the way State Plans are developed. A question that needs answering is whether the State Plan should be developed and implemented in conjunction with the State Advisory Council or involvement of the State Advisory Council. We should check the legislation carefully for this wording. (Administration proposal)

7) I do question the proposal for separate allotments for vocational education and occupational education. I have a difficult time trying to justify a separate terminology for vocational education and occupational education. Why is this necessary? Let's make a decision on what we are doing and use the same term. The proposal that high school programs be termed "vocational" and post-secondary programs be termed "occupational" is difficult for me to understand. This proposal will tend to cause a great deal of confusion and weaken the programs in both the high school and post-secondary institution.

I hope I have given you some things to consider in the group discussion.

ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE 1972 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS (PL 93-380) AND 1974 AMENDMENTS (PL 92-318)

by Robert Lawrence
California Council Chairman

Since the passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, the responsibilities of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education have increased by both federal and state statutes. In California, for example, our Council is represented on the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Manpower Services Council, in addition to interfacing with two state educational agencies and five pilot area vocational planning committees in the development of a state master plan for vocational education. It is interesting to note that these added responsibilities have been added without the benefit of any additional financial resources other than compensation for expenses when serving as a member of the Postsecondary Commission.*

There are, however, many benefits to be accrued by vocational education as a result of our active participation and influences on such commissions and councils. My brief remarks will be directed to the Advisory Council's responsibilities to the Postsecondary, or 1202, Commission and our potential role in the implementation of the Educational Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380).

The Advisory Council on Vocational Education is charged with the same responsibilities in Title X, the Community College and Occupational Education Act of 1972, of PL 92-318 as it has under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Under this act, the Postsecondary Commission is:

1) To strengthen the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education in order that it may effectively carry out the addi-

*The Postsecondary Commission budget is approximately $1,000,000 which is nearly all state funds.

tional functions imposed by this part;* and

2) To enable the State Commission to initiate and conduct a comprehensive program of planning for the establishment of the program authorized by this part.

The act further states that planning initiated by the 1202 Commission shall include: (1) assessment of current capabilities and facilities for occupational education, with needs and projected needs for such education in all parts of the state; (2) consideration of the most effective use of all existing institutions, public and private, for conducting such programs; (3) administrative procedures for resolving differences between vocational educators, community college educators, college and university educators, elementary and secondary educators, and other interested groups with respect to the administration of the program; (4) the development of a long-range strategy for infusing occupational education (including general orientation, counseling and guidance, and placement either in a job or in postsecondary occupational programs) into elementary and secondary schools on an equal footing with traditional academic education; and (5) the development of procedures to ensure continuous planning and evaluation.

It is my belief that the responsibilities of the State Advisory Councils are very broad and integral to the efforts of the Postsecondary Commission. Also, that our responsibilities extend beyond just planning and evaluation as indicated in my analysis of the act. If properly utilized, postsecondary commissions can influence the strengthening of vocational education at all levels.

Let me depart from my remarks on the legal responsibilities of Advisory Councils for a moment and give you some examples of our participation and influence on the California Postsecondary Commission.

First, the Commission began meeting in January 1974, but did not become official until April. The Commission assumed the responsibilities of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education as well as its

---

*Our interpretation of strengthening the Advisory Council includes providing additional financial resources. This aspect--additional resources--has been discussed and recognized by members of our Postsecondary Commission and the California Legislature.

newly defined role of the 1202 Commission. The Chairman of the Advisory Council is a member of the Commission and the Executive Director a member of an advisory committee to the Commission.

We have been successful in bringing to the Commission's attention the importance of occupational education in postsecondary education. Our continued dialogue with Commission members and segmental (higher education) representatives keeps their awareness level up. Our Executive Director, for example, has already presented testimony to two Commission committees concerning program review and evaluating the effectiveness of postsecondary education.

One of my jobs on the Commission is Chairman of the Academic and Occupational Education Program Review Committee. As an aside, the words "occupational education" were added to the committee's name after Tom Bogetich's testimony was presented. The committee is currently revising the program approval process, including occupational education. We have been successful in getting the committee to streamline the process in order to maintain flexibility in occupational program implementation. Also, we have influenced some changes in the organization of the Commission staff involved in the review process.

The Commission has begun to develop a planning process including occupational education. With regard to occupational education planning, Council input was utilized by the Commission staff in preparing initial planning documents. We anticipate continued involvement throughout the development of such a process.

The Commission is currently surveying the private vocational schools in California. Information gathered by the Advisory Council on this very important resource has been shared with the Commission.

Let me move on to the next federal law in my presentation. HR 69, or Public Law 93-380, amends the Vocational Education Act of 1963 by adding Part J--Bilingual Vocational Training. The Advisory Councils will be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and services provided for under Part J as we presently do for the other parts of the act.

Public Law 93-380 also provides for the establishment of an advisory council for adult education. Part A, Section 310A of Title VI provides:

(a) "Any state which receives assistance under this Title may establish and maintain a state advisory council, or may designate and

maintain an existing state advisory council which shall be, or has been, appointed by the governor or, in the case of a state in which members of the state board which governs the state education agency are elected (including election by the state legislatures) by such board.

(b) "(1) Such a state advisory council shall include as members persons, who, by reason of experience or training, are knowledgeable in the field of adult education or who are officials of state educational agencies or of local educational agencies of that state, persons who are or have received adult educational services and persons who are representatives of the general public."

The responsibilities assigned to state adult advisory councils are almost identical to those of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education:

(2) "Such a State Advisory Council, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, shall--

(A) advise the state educational agency on the development of, and policy matters arising in, the administration of the State Plan approved pursuant to Section 306;

(B) advise with respect to long-range planning and studies to evaluate adult education programs, services, and activities assisted under this act; and

(C) prepare and submit to the state educational agency and to the National Advisory Council for Adult Education established pursuant to Section 310, an annual report of its recommendations, accompanied by such additional comments of the state educational agency as that agency deems appropriate."

It is my belief that State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education can and should fulfill the responsibilities of adult councils if states desire to establish them. However, I must remind you that

adult councils are permissive, and there are NO federal funds made available for such councils. If your State Advisory Council is given this additional responsibility then I would advise you to seek additional funding from state funds made available under this act or from state sources other than VEA before taking on these responsibilities.

Finally, there are some other portions of Title IV of Public Law 93-380 that should be of interest and could mean additional responsibilities or involvement for State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. Namely, these are found in Part C--Educational Innovation and support and include:

Education for the Use of the Metric System of Measurement
Community Schools
Career Education
Consumers' Education
Women's Equity in Education

Each of these areas have a direct relationship to vocational education, and to comment on them is really not necessary.

As a final note, Public Law 93-380 does create several new national and state advisory councils. One of particular interest to us will be the National Advisory Council for Career Education. The purpos of this council will be to conduct a survey and assess the current status of career education programs, projects, curricula, and materials in the United States and submit to Congress, no later than November 1, 1975, a report on such survey and assessment. It is my belief that our Councils will be asked to provide input to the National Council.

ADVISORY COUNCILS' LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING ACT (CETA, PL 92-203)

by Daniel Kruger

In December 1973, the Congress enacted and the President signed the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 commonly referred to as CETA. This is an historic piece of legislation. Section 2 states the purpose of the Act and reads as follows:

> It is the purpose of this Act to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons, and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities and enhance self-sufficiency by establishing a flexible and decentralized system of Federal, State and local programs.

The key words are a flexible and decentralized system of Federal, State and local programs. This Act alters Federally supported manpower training programs in several ways:

1) It eliminates categorical manpower programs such as those previously under the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962 as amended and the manpower programs provided under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended. These include MDTA institutional and on-the-job training, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, basic education programs for unemployed workers, new career programs and concentrated unemployment programs. The MDTA and Parts A, B and E of Title I, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are repealed by CETA.

2) It provides block grants to local prime sponsors which are units of general local government having a population of 100,000. Combinations of local units of government with a population of 100,000 or more. There are other specialized situations for

local prime sponsors as prescribed by the Act. The state can also be a prime sponsor. However, the states in most instances have those geographical areas not included in a local prime sponsor's area. The area served by a state under this Act is referred to as the Balance of State.

3) The elected local officials of the governmental units which qualify under the Act constitute the local prime sponsors. The local prime sponsor receives the block grant from the U.S. Department of Labor on the basis of a manpower plan submitted. The amount of dollars a local prime sponsor receives is based on a formula which includes (1) the amount of funds received in the prior fiscal year, (2) unemployment in the area and (3) low income individuals residing in the area. The local prime sponsors have the legislative authority to spend the money to provide manpower services to meet the needs of their local area as defined in their local manpower plan. They decide what kinds of manpower programs are to be conducted in their area and what agencies shall deliver or provide these services.

4) The Act (Section 112) provides supplemental vocational assistance. The Secretary of Labor is given legislative authority to utilize five percent of the appropriations for Title I programs as a supplement to vocational education. The Secretary of Labor makes the grants to governors to provide financial assistance "through state vocational education boards to provide needed vocational education services in areas served by prime sponsors." Five percent of Title I amounted to approximately $65 to $70 million for supplemental vocational assistance in Fiscal 1975.

This section (112) has critically important implications for vocational education. The additional federal funds outside of the regular federal sources of unding are indeed needed given the magnitude of the financial problems for vocational education. The Act nonetheless raises the following problem areas: A reading of this Section indicates that the state agency will develop a plan acceptable to the governor and will distribute this allocation to prime sponsors according to the formula prescribed in the Act. The Act is unclear whether the local

prime sponsor passes these funds to the school district or districts in the sponsor's area or whether the local prime sponsor will be able to develop vocational programs of its own.

A second concern is how will these funds be spent? Will they be spent to strengthen and expand vocational education or will they be spent for other purposes? For example, it is my understanding that some states have spent this supplement to pay for training allowances under MDTA type institutional training. This is, I regret to say, permissible under the CETA regulations.

A third question is related to the State Plan for Vocational Education. Will these funds be spent in accordance with the State Plan or at the discretion of the prime sponsors? This question has been answered in part by states utilizing funds to pay training allowances. My information, addmittedly very sketchy, is that these funds, where used to strengthen vocational education, are not being spent in accordance with the State Plan.

Still another concern is what standards of performance will be used to evaluate how these funds have been used. There must be some kind of accountability so that the impact of this supplement to vocational education can be evaluated. This further suggests the need for a special reporting system. At the minimum there is need to know how these funds were spent and hopefully what was accomplished. Such information is needed if the Congress is to be persuaded to continue providing supplemental vocational assistance under CETA.

A fourth concern is the relationship of the State Department of Education or the state agency involved in the supplement to the local prime sponsor. If the local prime sponsor passes these funds to the local school district or districts, does the state agency deal with the local prime sponsor or the school district or both in resolving these problem areas?

A fifth concern is related to the extent to which local prime sponsors will shape the state vocational program. Does CETA provide a foot in the door for local government units to help shape vocational programs, and if so, is this desirable? I raise the question only because of its implication.

There are other concerns under CETA for State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. The Act provides that the governor establish a State Manpower Services Council. The Act mandates that one member be a representative of "The State Board of Vocational Education (Sec-

tion 107(a) 2 ii). I assume that the governors are doing this, providing they have taken action to establish such a council. No information is readily available as to the composition of the State Manpower Services and their activities. Surely here is an opportunity for the representative of the State Board of Vocational Education to educate the State Manpower Services Council on the problems of vocational education in the state. Moreover, it would seem that the State Plan for Vocational Education should be an integral or companion document to the state manpower plan. Moreover, in my view, the annual state manpower plan should not only include the annual state vocational plan, but also the plan of the state vocational rehabilitation service and the annual plan of service of the State Employment Service. These composite plans should be reviewed by the governor's office and by a joint review team composed of representatives of the U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare at the regional level. It would seem that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should mandate the establishment of a state health manpower plan as a precondition of funding training programs for health occupations. If such an action is taken, it should also involve the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.

The Act (Section 104) also provides for a prime sponsor's planning council, with representation from education and training agencies. It is the function of this Council

> "to submit recommendations regarding program plans and basic goals, policies, and procedures, to monitor and provide for objective evaluations of employment and training programs conducted in the prime sponsorship area, and to provide for continuing analyses of needs for employment, training, and related services in such area. Any final decision with respect to such recommendations shall be made by the prime sponsor."

The State Advisory Council should monitor to ascertain if each prime sponsor has included a representative of the public vocational program on such a planning council. Moreover, it would seem that the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education should establish contact with the educational representatives on the local planning councils to establish a communication network between the Council and these representatives. There should be two-way communication between the

Council and these representatives. It is the responsibility of the State Advisory Council, among other things, to monitor vocational education programs in the state and it is therefore important that the Council be familiar with and knowledgeable about the manpower services being provided by and through the local prime sponsors.

In summary, CETA has provided a unique opportunity for the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education to become more involved in manpower planning broadly defined. This is as it should be. The American economy has become a job economy in which ninety percent of the nation's labor force are employees. Thus for most Americans preparing for a job, finding a job, keeping a job, and moving to a better job are crucial matters. The State Advisory Councils can indeed contribute to a more effective functioning of the job economy.

NATIONAL AND STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Kenneth Cole

I know that vocational education is an area of deep interest and concern to all of you. It also concerns President Ford who--in his speech at Ohio State University in August--charged each of us with endeavoring to strengthen the ties between the academic and the work community for all students, regardless of the level of their education. The President believes that vocational education must shoulder a major responsibility for helping to strengthen the relationship between these two educational communities. That's the key reason behind my coming to Arizona to meet with you this morning.

As we look to the future and in keeping with the questions raised by President Ford at Ohio State University--what will vocational education's impact be on integrating the educational experiences of our young people with their work experiences? Broad experiences such as orientation to the world of work, exploration of jobs, and guidance and counseling all contribute broadly to a student's realistic knowledge about jobs and what it is like to work. Vocational education provides the student with the specific skills and attitudes necessary to obtain a job and advance within it. This, of course, has been vocational education's historical role. Its potential for even a larger impact is great indeed.

But dealing with the opportunities of better education and vocational education goes far beyond today's specific concerns and programs. It goes to the kind of government we have, and the relations of each part of that government to each other--and more importantly, the relations of government with the private sector and with each individual American.

The past six years of my life have been spent observing and working in and around the Presidency, and I thought it might be interesting for you if I talked a little bit about these relationships. So that is what I propose for this morning--to talk a little bit about the Presidency--not anyone in particular, but the Presidency in general--and this balance of power between the President and Congress that we have heard so much about this year--and what we're going to hear more about in the future.

You know, President Truman once said, "I sit here all day trying to persuade people to do the things they ought to have sense enough to do without my persuading....That's all the powers of the President amount to."

When I was preparing to go to Washington in late 1968, I felt it would be a good idea to do some preparation--to gain a better understanding of how the Presidency worked. Required reading at that time was the book that had been the "Bible" of President Kennedy's Administration--Richard Neustadt's Presidential Power.

Neustadt concluded that Truman was right, and that short of the last resort of outright command, all the trappings of the Presidency were really supports for his power to persuade people to do things the way HE wanted them done.

Fourteen years have passed since Professor Neustadt's book first appeared, and today in 1974, there is an awful lot of talk and concern about how our Presidency has become an "imperial Presidency," as the title of Arthur Schlesinger's latest, best-selling, book-of-the-month describes it.

Professor Schlesinger fears that an unbridled Presidency now poses a formidable threat to our system of balanced government, shared by separated powers.

The Vietnam war, efforts to control the budget through impoundments, the claims of executive privilege, and the Watergate scandal are cited as proof of an imperial Presidency of vast and virtually uncontrollable powers.

You probably know the story about Lyndon Johnson striding across the White House lawn toward some waiting helicopters. A young Marine pointed him toward one, and said, "That's your helicopter, Mr. President." And Johnson looked at him, and said, "Son, they're ALL my helicopters."

In the sense of possession and prerogative and publicity, the modern President is clearly the power center of our whole system. But for a modern President, possessing the power and exercising it have become two very different things. Before the 1952 Presidential campaign began, President Truman used to speculate about the problems General Eisenhower would have if he won the election. "He'll sit here," Truman would say, tapping his desk for emphasis, "and he'll say, 'Do this! Do that!' And nothing will happen. Poor Ike--it won't be a bit like the Army. He'll find it very frustrating."

Lyndon Johnson himself became the best example of the difference between simply possessing Presidential power and the ability to exercise it. Critics like Professor Schlesinger say that by acting unilaterally to commit forces in Vietnam before Congress could have its say, President Johnson was able to usurp the war-making power which the Constitution clearly--and wisely--vested in Congress.

I think that there is another, broader interpretation that fits the facts better. The first years of the Johnson Presidency were unparalleled examples of what a President can accomplish with a combination of skill, determination, persistence, popularity, persuasion, and a friendly Congress.

He was the prime practitioner of Presidential power as defined by Truman and Neustadt: Lyndon Johnson just knew how to persuade the hell out of people. Then, in 1965, President Johnson made a number of decisions about expanding and fighting the war in Vietnam.

As David Halberstam describes it, the President was advised by the best, and the brightest people in his Administration that he could have a quick and low-cost Vietnam victory, and then get right back to building his Great Society here at home.

So Vietnam, if this interpretation is right, far from being the high point of the imperial Presidency, involved more a mortgaging of Presidential power in order to fight a war that turned out--for him--to be unwinnable as well as expensive.

As far as Presidential power was concerned, Vietnam was a risk, and the President who took it had to pay the price by renouncing the second term that almost everyone had conceded would be his for the asking.

But let's take a brief look at some of the constraints and limitations on this so-called "imperial" Presidential power.

First, there is the constraint of time. Even for a President, there are only twenty-four hours in a day. He has to allow for the heavy ceremonial load, the unavoidable managerial demands, and the unexpected developments and crises, before he begins to think about taking time to study and reflect on things, much less before he has a chance to relax and take it easy.

Another constraint involves the people who work for him. Like most executives, a President's effectiveness is largely determined by the men and women around him, on whom he must depend to get him the best information possible, to help him reach the right decision, and

then to make sure his decisions are publicized, understood, and carried out. This is a problem shared and understood by every executive and Administration--federal or local, in business, and even in academics--but with the President, it is magnified to a national and global scale.

A third constraint involves the information a President has to get. Great decisions require a very high quality and usually a fairly high quantity of information. The energy crisis is a good example of this. When the Arab oil embargo suddenly exacerbated an already adversely developing situation, we immediately tried to make an assessment of where we stood in terms of supply stocks and reserves. That information is kept--or, in some cases, not kept--by the oil companies themselves; different companies use different standards of measurement; very few of the companies were eager to release the information, and some resisted or outright refused. The President issued an Executive Order requiring the information right away, and part of the energy legislation which was sent to Congress was a Bill requiring a complete and uniform audit and disclosure of all fuel stocks and reserves.

I know that this will strike many people as ironic and surprising, but even the President of the United States can't always, or immediately, get whatever information he needs, even when vital national decisions have to be made. And without the information and the facts, it's often difficult to define the problem, let alone solve it.

Speaking of facts and problems reminds me of a brief story. The one about the international airline stewardess school. One day, they had a survival quiz, and asked each stewardess to answer the same question: Your plane has gone down and you are the only survivor. You swim to a nearby desert island, and find that it is inhabited by a platoon of Marines which has been stranded there for almost ten years. What would you do.

The British stewardess replied that her survival kit would contain a revolver and she would use that to protect her honor.

The American stewardess replied that the platoon would probably have a commander, and she'd get in good with him so that he could protect her and take care of her.

And the French stewardess replied that she understood the facts but didn't see the problem....

Another constraint of a President's power is the immense influence

of the mass media. Studies show that most people now get their news and information from television, with newspapers running an increasingly distant second. In terms of public opinion, television has become the basic means of Presidential persuasion and Presidential criticism. Think back; can you remember anytime you've ever heard anything good said on network TV about a Presidential action? Any Presidential action?

Then there is the factor of prior constraint. For example, fully seventy-five percent of the federal budget is already committed to ongoing programs like Social Security and Veterans Benefits before a President gets a chance to make his own appropriations and allocations.

Courting and keeping public support plays a big part in constraining Presidential power. During his first term, a President must be careful not to unnecessarily estrange or alienate any constituency that he will need for his re-election. It is said that a President starts running for re-election the minute he is sworn in. It is ironic, with the passage of the 22nd Amendment limiting a President to two terms, that he becomes a sort of lame duck the minute he is sworn in for the second time!

If a President is able to capture public interest and support for something--the way President Kennedy did for the space program and as President Johnson did at least for the beginning of his Great Society programs--then a lot of other constraints can be overcome, particularly the greatest constraint of them all: Congress.

In our system, you might say that the President proposes but Congress disposes. Individuals aside, Congress itself, as a co-equal and independent branch of government, solemnly and jealously guards its rights and privileges.

This is where the Neustadt element of persuasion becomes so important, getting Congressmen and Senators to dove-tail their own long-term careers, power, pride, responsibilities, judgments, and ambitions with the President's four or eight year legislative philosophy and programs.

In terms of our system of governmental power, separated between independent branches which check and balance each other, the greatest and grayest threat in the last four decades may not come from an imperial Presidency, but from what some soon might call an imperial Congress. It is this Congressional constraint which makes me think that

an "imperial" President, who can run off with our whole system of government unless his power is curbed, is just not possible.

The fact is that we probably have, right now, the weakest institutional Presidency in this century. When people call for a need for balance--give this some thought--things are already balanced, or unbalanced, in favor of the Congress--both Houses of Congress are controlled now by the opposition party. This means the so-called "honeymoon period" is at best short-lived.

It means that, in terms of the most basic and important of Presidential powers, the power to persuade, President Ford always faces an uphill fight, and has on most issues since the day he entered office.

Not only does this situation exist with the Congress, but also with the bureaucracy as each President must deal with and depend upon a vast and unwieldy federal organization, which had been extended and nurtured and cosseted by years of indulgent experiment and encouragement during the 1960s under predecessors who believed in big government.

In fact, I suspect that a lot of people, like Professor Schlesinger, who think that they are afraid of an imperial Presidency, are really afraid of what is in fact a very unimperial Presidency, but one which does represent and, given the chance, will embody in legislation, a philosophy which is opposed to big government, be it Presidential or Congressional big government, in our American system, and which, to that extent, does threaten their deepest held beliefs about big government and the role it would play in our society.

In the case of this Administration, they are right to worry, because President Ford does believe that big government simply can't cut it for America anymore. When big government began getting bigger, during FDR's New Deal of the 1930s, we were confronted with enormous problems.

Today, after just forty years, we still have problems, but America has grown so big nationally that we have outgrown big government and need some responsive smallness once again.

This is a paradox of present-day politics that President Ford is trying to meet with his programs. It is a paradox that a lot of young people saw developing for some time, and expressed in their concern about not being folded, spindled, or mutilated.

It is a paradox that we have become so big that we have to begin thinking small again.

Our giant corporations and our giant universities and our giant government must cut through the enormous numbers with which they have to deal and see the people, the individual men, women and children, hidden behind those punched-out punch cards and those endless rows of statistical print-outs. Our individual diversity has become more important than our national bigness, and we now need government which can respond as fast and as fully as possible to meet the unique needs of people where they live and how they live.

It doesn't make good sense, and it sure doesn't make good management, if the federal government alone tries to provide extensive and rigid categorical social and community services for all the people in all these states. Trying to implement this philosophy is not easy. It goes in the face of forty years' growth in the opposite direction, and one has to step on some Congressional and bureaucratic toes in terms of appropriations and seniority.

But we intend to keep plugging away, and I think that the results will prove us right. For instance, you can see this philosophy in the President's attitude toward vocational education. As I said earlier, he's called upon those of us involved with vocational education to strengthen the ties between the academic and the work community regardless of the education level. And he wants to see the states assume more responsibility in strengthening those ties. As a result of the concerns he voiced in his August speech at Ohio State University, the Administration is preparing various proposals on vocational education which will be submitted to the President in early December for his review and decision.

One of these proposals gives states greater flexibility in maximizing both their public and private resources in providing vocational education. It is expected that the strengthening of state vocational educational agencies will be the necessary mechanism for improving and expanding the role of vocational education. While the historical role of ov vocational education has been to provide the student with specific skills and attitudes necessary to obtain and succeed at a job, we see the provision of proposals now under study as giving the state agencies the necessary flexibility to go beyond the traditional. For instance, new and effective strategies could be developed to expand work experience programs, to furnish strong guidance and counseling services, and to establish more effective teacher in-service training.

What we are really talking about is faith--faith in people, in the

American people, to make their own choices and their own decisions and live their lives as they choose.

When it comes to judgments about having low-income housing or new schools...When it comes to choosing between a subway system or buying new buses...When it is a matter of deciding between hiring people where they are really needed to work in the productive economy or supporting new public assistance programs...

We believe that elected officials in local communities, officials who are close to the people and more responsive to their wishes are the best bet for finding, for feeling, and reflecting a sense of what the people of that community need and want. A much better bet than those of us who were not elected and who spend our days sitting behind a desk in Washington. And then, we come to the question of controlling the budget.

We think it's the federal budget, but frankly, I think it's the taxpayer's budget. Federal funds aren't money that just exists. It's money that comes from the people through taxes. So when we spend it, we owe it to the people to spend it on programs that are making their lives better and richer and fuller and more meaningful instead of just adding to the already heavy tax burden that the people bear or by expanding the shape and nature and scope of the federal government's role in the life of each and every American.

This, then, is my assessment of today's debate about the imperial Presidency, or perhaps we should say the imperial Congress. There are many questions--they are questions we shall need your help to ask--and to answer.

There is something that you should be vitally involved in, because you have the most obvious and vital stake in it. I'm talking about decisions and issues that will shape the real quality of the lives we lead in this country. I'm talking also about questions about how our children are educated and whether we have transportation to get to work, and whether we can get jobs, and how we can buy our houses, or whether our business will grow and prosper. I'm talking about the kind of feeling a man has when he knows that if someone in his family gets sick, he won't have to worry about being able to afford the best possible medical care. And I'm talking about the feeling someone down on their luck can have if they can still determine how they will live rather than have some federal bureaucrat dictate it to them.

These are decisions that are being made now and in the next few

years. You and your children will be living out your lives with the results of the decisions that are made, or not made, and the questions that are asked, or not asked, over the next few years, so you might as well exercise your option to play a part in making them.

As we stand on the eve of America's 200th birthday, and as we plunge into the last quarter of the Twentieth Century, we should remember that the best the founders dared to promise was life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We can never rest because our job is never finished. The important thing is to keep a sense of spirit--and a sense of humor. The main thing is not to lose heart or hope, no matter how sad or sordid or crummy the whole thing may seem at any one time. The best thing is to get in and be able to say that you have done something that made a difference for the better.

I think of something John Gardner wrote. He said that a nation is never finished. You can't just build it and leave it standing, like the Pharoahs did the Pyramids. A nation must be renewed and recreated by each generation of committed, caring men and women.

And now it is our turn. If we do not believe, and if we do not care, then nothing can save this nation. But if we do believe, and if we do care, then nothing can stop us.

REPORTS ON WORKSHOPS

WORKSHOP I:
1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS AND PROPOSED 1975 AMENDMENTS

Group Leaders: Ms. Virginia Vieregg, Nebraska Advisory Council
Mr. Doug Fellows, Connecticut Advisory Council

Reviewing their legal obligations under Public Law 90-576 and subsequent amendments in relation to proposed legislation, the delegates said the current legislation seems adequate to meet our needs. The problem is not one of failure to write proper statutes--it is one of administration.

No one escaped criticism, including the State Councils. It was stated that Congress was at fault by not providing forward funding in adequate time for states to prepare and accept proposals.

The State Plan, in most cases, has become a compliance document and the delegates felt that perhaps a clarification should be made, stating whether it is a fiscal document or a plan.

The U.S. Office of Education does not enforce its own regulations. There has been no action when there have been cases of complete disagreement. State Councils have often been unable, unwilling, or afraid to exert moral leadership.

The delegates were most critical of the college proposed legislation, HR 17-305. One group said it was simply beyond any value and didn't even deserve criticism. In general, the points were made that it distorts the sole state agency principle; it separates secondary and post-secondary educational functions; it puts Advisory Councils in an administrative position; it overloads the Council membership who might be favorable to junior college concepts through elimination; it wrecks the unfettered and articulated delivery system we are required to make under present legislation. The proposed formula for allocation of funds on a 40-40-20 basis is not defensible, since state needs differ, and the allocation of funds should be left to the single agency required under present legislation.

The AVA legislation, in many respects, provided some useful thought for consideration. The Council members, however, felt that the advantages which might be gained would be offset by possible confusion as the entire structhure of government readjusted. It was stated by one group that, since there was time to state a position, it was felt

that the AVA legislation should receive reaction from Council members at this time.

Other concerns were that the proposed AVA amendment made State Boards of Education the final authority for vocational education; that it was too carefully structured; and that it required additional membership on State Councils, which would make them unwieldy and ineffective.

The Council delegates discussed openly and freely all the materials presented to them and, without exception, would have continued beyond the closing hour.

As a general criticism reflecting reaction to Council, Congress, and the bureaucracy, one member remarked that if we spent half as much time moving kids as we do paper, we might accomplish something.

WORKSHOP II:
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 AND 1974

Group Leader: Mr. Richard Owens, Georgia Advisory Council

The participants felt that the concept of the 1972 Amendments was good but that inadequate guidelines had produced a great deal of misunderstanding. There appears to be too much duplication at the national and state levels. Many people found themselves in several conflicting assignments. Delegates in this workshop made the recommendation to the full assembly and subsequently to the National Advisory Council that someone at the national level define the function of the 1202 Commission and outline its legal implications regarding Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. The delegates felt that there was a definite lack of direction from the national level and suggested that an effort be undertaken to insure that adequate guidelines are forthcoming.

The conference participants were not knowledgeable enough about the 1974 Amendments to make any concrete decisions or recommendations. However, they did feel that there is an excessive number of various commissions and advisory boards, and that if careful planning and coordination is not accomplished, there will be a tremendous duplication of effort.

REPORT FROM WORKSHOP III:
COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING ACT (CETA)

Group Leader: Mr. Francis Morrison, Indiana Council

CETA is a consolidation of Labor Department legislation including the Manpower Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. It is also a form of decentralization of these types of programs. It incorporates the revenue sharing concept as was alluded to in the presentation by Dr. Kruger. This decentralization allows metropolitan areas or consortiums of local governmental districts with populations of 100,000 or more to become prime sponsors for offering the various services provided under this act.

It is extremely important to point out that the target group to be served by the funds allocated in this legislation are the economically disadvantaged, the unemployed, and the underemployed. This is clearly legislation dealing with the people for whom the regular educational system has not provided adequately. As was pointed out be one of the speakers at this conference, the Second Report of the National Advisory Council, published in 1969, took the position that "the federal government should invest at least as much money in reducing the flow of untrained youth as it invests in reducing the pool of unemployed."

During the presentations yesterday, several of the speakers made comments concerning the State Advisory Councils' role pertaining to CETA. The focus of those comments varied from concern that proliferation of State Advisory Council activity would result in ineffectiveness to the necessity for State Advisory Councils to become greatly involved with CETA. The middle initials of CETA represent the words "employment training." This to me is a brief, but distinct definition of vocational education.

In the group discussions that were held yesterday, the membership attending this conference spoke their thoughts relating to the Comprehensive Employment Training Act. Over one hundred of you worked hard on a relatively new topic. I was impressed with your sincere efforts as a long day of meetings ended. I have attempted to summarize in seven statements the input from those participating in these group discussions:

1) There is a need for clearer understanding of the CETA legislation by State Advisory Council members.

2) There is a need for cooperation among State Advisory Councils, State Vocational Boards, and CETA to provide a comprehensive statewide program of vocational training services (State Advisory Council representation on the State Manpower Council should be recommended to appointing authorities).

3) There is a need for coordination of the state CETA plan and state vocational education plan.

4) State Advisory Councils should take the initiative in these early stages to become involved in CETA planning.

5) State Advisory Councils should take the initiative to promote local community understanding of vocational education and CETA legislation and motivate local communities to become more actively involved.

6) State Advisory Councils should have responsibilities for monitoring and evaluating vocational education services provided through state vocational boards.

7) The National Advisory Council should serve as a clearing house for State Advisory Councils' involvement with CETA, and share that information with all states.

One point that appeared to need clarification by most of the participants in the discussion group dealt with the five percent of Title I funds and the specific wording of the law relating to those funds. I want to quote two very short parts of Public Law 93-203 (CETA) which should clarify for those in attendance at this conference that part of this legislation. Under the heading, Allocation of Funds, a sub-paragraph states in part:

"...five percent of the funds available under Title I shall be available only for grants under Section 112."

Section 112 of the law then states:

"(a) From the funds available to him for this section, the Secretary (of Labor) shall make grants to Governors to provide financial assistance, through State vocational education boards, to provide needed vocational education services in areas served by prime sponsors.

"(b) All of the sums available to carry out this section shall be allotted among the States in the manner provided for allotting funds under section 103A.

"(c) Funds available under this section shall be used only for providing vocational education and services to participants in programs under this title in accordance with an agreement between the State vocational education board and the prime sponsor."

In addition to the five percent funding through State Boards of vocational education, one of the requirements specifically stated in the law is that each state manpower services council shall have one representative of state boards of vocational education. The intent of the authors of this legislation would appear to be to legislate cooperation --if that is possible. It is most significant, I think, that these ties with the educational structure in our states are identified in this new Labor Department legislation.

To the best of my knowledge, previous legislation which CETA replaced left unstated any committed cooperation between these two agencies. I am referring to the five percent funding and representation on the state manpower councils. I believe this is a result of Advisory Council activity, specifically that of the National Advisory Council in its efforts to bring the total vocational education efforts in this country together for the good of all of the people we are charged to serve.

Although the law is not specific, I believe the intent of CETA is to provide services for people rather than to establish training programs or skill centers as we had under MDTA. The interpretation in our state is to help people get needed training through contracting with existing programs of vocational education whenever possible. I believe that active Advisory Councils and vocational educators in national, state and local situations CAN work with the prime sponsors and manpower

service councils in a spirit of cooperation. United, we can provide better employment services. This is the challenge I leave with you.

Are you willing to dig in and work at developing this cooperation in your state and local community? I believe this is what Congress wanted when they developed CETA. It is a good effort on their part and the rest is up to us.

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION
BY STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
RELATIVE TO FEDERAL SUPPORT
OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

WHEREAS: The Federal government, responding to the desires of the people, has traditionally stimulated and supported the growth and improvement of vocational education so that quality programs and services will be available to all people in all communities; and

WHEREAS: The purpose of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education is to assist in the improvement and extension of vocational education services to all people; and

WHEREAS: State Advisory Councils accomplish this purpose by analyzing the needs of people, examining the efforts of state systems of vocational education to meet these needs, and by recommending suitable improvements; and

WHEREAS: State Advisory Councils' recommendations have resulted in substantially improved programs and services; and

WHEREAS: The State Advisory Councils have heretofore been restricted from fully exercising their mandated responsibilities because of insufficient funding; and

WHEREAS: The House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Administration have all supported full funding for State Advisory Councils as indicated in pending appropriation bills;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Administration and Congress be commended for supporting the full authorized levels of expenditure for State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.

Passed on March 14, 1974 at a joint meeting of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.